



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,499	11/05/2001	Christian Rosenmund	VOSS1160	9348

28213 7590 01/10/2005

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE
SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133

EXAMINER

MURPHY, JOSEPH F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/807,499

Applicant(s)

ROSENMUND ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph F Murphy

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-20 and 24-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04012004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group VII, claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 in the response filed 10/25/2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups correspond to the same inventive concept, namely the provision of a non-desensitizing AMPA-receptor comprising one defined mutation. This is not found persuasive because CFR 1.475 (a) indicates that a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. CFR 1.475(e) indicates that the determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim (MPEP R-90 -- R-91 and 1893.03(d)). Here, while the groups are drawn to AMPA receptors, the special technical feature which is a contribution over the prior art is the individual mutation. Since these mutations are different for the AMPA receptors of each Group, the restriction requirement is proper and is made FINAL. Claims 18-20, 24-33 are withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b). Claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 are under consideration.

Art Unit: 1646

Claim Objections

Claims 1-23, 34-35, 37 are objected to because of the following informalities: They contain limitations drawn to non-elected Groups. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims as written read on host cells, including eukaryotic and animal cells. There is no limitation wherein the host cells are isolated or in culture, therefore the claims read on transfected cells in a human, and thus are not patentable subject matter. This rejection could be obviating by adding a limitation wherein the host cells are isolated or in culture.

Claim 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, which is enabling for a nucleic acid encoding a full length AMPA Receptor protein of SEQ ID NO: 7, or a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 17, does not reasonably provide enablement for a complement of a nucleic acid which hybridizes to a nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO: 7; or a nucleic acid which encodes SEQ ID NO: 7 and further comprising amino acid additions substitutions or deletions; or a nucleic acid which encodes an AMPA-type receptor and further comprising amino acid additions substitutions or deletions. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 are overly broad since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of nucleic acids encode variant polypeptides which will retain the characteristics of AMPA Receptor. However, Applicants do not disclose any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of AMPA Receptor. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. For example, As an example of the unpredictable effects of mutations on protein function, Mickle et al. teaches that cystic fibrosis is an autosomal recessive disorder caused by abnormal function of a chloride channel, referred to as the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) (page

Art Unit: 1646

597). Several mutations can cause CF, including the G551D mutation. In this mutation a glycine replaces the aspartic acid at position 551, giving rise to the CF phenotype. In the most common CF mutation, delta-F508, a single phenylalanine is deleted at position 508, giving rise to the CF phenotype. Thus showing that even the substitution or deletion of a single amino acid in the entire 1480 amino acid CFTR protein sequence can have dramatic and unpredictable effects on the function of the protein. Additionally, it is known in the art that even a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the architecture of an entire cell. For example, Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 230, column 2, first paragraph). Additionally, Yan et al. teaches that in certain cases, a change of two-amino acid residues in a protein results in switching the binding of the protein from one receptor to another (Yan et al., Two-amino acid molecular switch in an epithelial morphogen that regulates binding to two distinct receptors. *Science* 290: 523-527, 2000). Since the claims encompass nucleic acids encoding variant polypeptides and given the art recognized unpredictability of the effect of mutations on protein function, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. While the Specification discloses that the encoded polypeptide functions in the chondrocyte re-differentiation assay, the claims do not set forth a functional limitation for

Art Unit: 1646

the nucleic acids encoding the variant polypeptides and since the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, and the predictability of which amino acids can be substituted is extremely complex and outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a polypeptide's structure from mere sequence data are limited. Since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the polynucleotide and the encoded polypeptide are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Applicant is required to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, while the claims encompass polynucleotides and encoded polypeptides which the specification only teaches one skilled in the art to test for functional variants. It would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides. Since the claims do not enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides, but only teaches how to screen for the claimed polypeptides, and since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the polypeptides are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Thus, since Applicant has only taught how to test for nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of AMPA Receptor, and has not taught how to make nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of AMPA Receptor, it would require undue experimentation of one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polynucleotides.

Art Unit: 1646

Claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The claims are drawn to a complement of a nucleic acid which hybridizes to a nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO: 7; or a nucleic acid which encodes SEQ ID NO: 7 and further comprising amino acid additions substitutions or deletions; or a nucleic acid which encodes an AMPA-type receptor and further comprising amino acid additions substitutions or deletions and are thus genus claims. The specification and claim do not indicate what distinguishing attributes shared by the members of the genus. The specification and claims do not place any limit on the number of amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions that may be made to the encoded AMPA Receptor variants. Thus, the scope of the claim includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claim do not provide any guidance as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the nucleic acid class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or

Art Unit: 1646

characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, SEQ ID NO: 17 encoding SEQ ID NO: 7 is insufficient to describe the genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e. structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. In the instant case, the specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features of the genus of polynucleotides. There is no description of the conserved regions which are critical to the structure and function of the genus claimed. There is no description of the sites at which variability may be tolerated and there is no information regarding the relation of structure to function. Furthermore, the prior art does not provide compensatory structural or correlative teachings sufficient to enable one of skill to isolate and identify the polynucleotides and polypeptides encompassed. Thus, no identifying characteristics or properties of the instant polypeptides are provided such that one of skill would be able to predictably identify the encompassed molecules as being identical to those instantly claimed. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Art Unit: 1646

Claims 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a host cell in culture comprising a polynucleotide with the sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 17, does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* transfection.

The specification discloses that the nucleic acids of the current invention can be expressed in a wide variety of host cell types, including cells within a host animal. However, there are no actual or prophetic examples that disclose how to make or use host cells that comprise a DNA sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 17 in an animal. The Examiner cites Eck & Wilson (page 81, column 2, second paragraph to page 82, column 1, second paragraph) who report that numerous factors complicate *in vivo* gene expression which have not been shown to be overcome by routine experimentation. These include, the fate of the DNA vector itself (volume distribution, rate of clearance into the tissues, etc.), the *in vivo* consequences of altered gene expression and protein function, the fraction of vector taken up by the target cell population, the trafficking of the genetic material within cellular organelles, the rate of degradation of the DNA, the level of mRNA produced, the stability of the mRNA produced, the amount and stability of the protein produced, and the protein's compartmentalization within the cell, or its secretory fate, once produced. Since the instant disclosure does not address any of the methods necessary to make a host cell in an animal which comprises the polynucleotide of interest, the claims as written are not enabled. This rejection could be overcome by addition of the limitation wherein the host cells are isolated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is indefinite in the recitation of the term "derived from". It is unclear whether this term imposes a required limitation on the claim, such that it only encompasses, for example, polynucleotides amplified from human cDNA, or only sequences produced by digestion with restriction enzymes of DNA isolated from human tissue which contains polynucleotides encoding the receptor, or if the claim encompasses all polynucleotide sequences that encode the receptor. Therefore, the metes and bounds of the claim are unclear.

Claims 34-35 provide for the use of the nucleic acid of claim 1, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to cover. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Art Unit: 1646

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stratagene (1991).

The Stratagene catalogue teaches the use of random 9-mers capable of hybridizing to all gene sequences. The random primers meet the limitations of claim 2 in that said primers are isolated DNA capable of hybridizing to a sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 17 under the conditions provided in the claim.

Conclusion

Claims 1-17, 21-23, 34-35, 37 are rejected.

Advisory Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-0877. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1646

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
December 30, 2004


JOSEPH MURPHY
PATENT EXAMINER